DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 021 HE 001 847

AUTHOR Jacobsen, John F.: Erickson, Gerald TITLE Graduate Assistant Survey 1969-70.

INSTITUTION Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette. Institutional

Research Office.

PUB DATE Jun 70 NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.00

DESCRIPTORS *Graduate Students, *Higher Education,

*Questionnaires, *Teaching Assistants

IDENTIFIERS *Northern Michigan University

ABSTRACT

This study describes the graduate assistants' (GA) responsibility at Northern Michigan University, assesses their work load and working conditions, and provides a means whereby the assistants could make suggestions for improving the assistantship program. Data was obtained from 59 of the 60 GA's who completed a guestionnaire distributed in February 1970. Information is presented on: (1) GA's by departments and sex; (2) origin of bachelor's degree; (3) age; (4) year bachelor's degree was earned; (5) distribution of GA's by years of prior full-time work experience; (6) their sources of funds in addition to the assistantship; (7) numbers of credit carried Fall and Spring semesters; (8) anticipated employment following graduation; (9) distribution of GA's by hours devoted perweek to assistantship duties; (10) distribution of GA's by hours of work and study per week; (11) assistance received with teaching responsibilities: (12) satisfaction with supervision of non-teaching responsibilities: (13) benefits and disadvantages of the GA; and (14) suggestions to improve the program. The questionnaire is included in the appendix. (AF)



Northern Michigan University Office of Institutional Research

Graduate Assistant Survey Northern Michigan University 1969-70

> John P. Jacobsen Gerald Erickson

Office of Institutional Research Kalmer E. Stordahl. Director

June 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION

A WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE FERCON OR
ORGANIZATION ONIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REFREENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LAR 100 FILE

Table of Contents

Introduct	ionpage î
Results o	of the Surveypages 1-5
Summary	and Conclusionspages 5-6
List of T	ables:
1.	Graduate Assistants by Department and Sex page 7
2.	Origin of Bachelor's Degreepage 7
3.	Graduate Assistants by Agepage 7
4.	Year Bachelor's Degree Earnedpage 8
5.	Distribution of Graduate Assistants by Years of Prior Full-Time Work Experience
6.	Source of Fundspage 8
7.	Number of Credits Carried Fall and Spring Semesterspage 9
8.	AnticipatedEmployment Following Graduationpage 9
9.	Distribution of Graduate Assistants by Hours Devoted Per Week to Assistantship Duties
10.	Distribution of Graduate Assistants by Hours of Work and Study Per Weekpage 10
11.	Assistance Received with Teaching Responsibilitiespage 10
12.	Satisfaction with Supervision of Non-teaching Responsibilities
	page 10
	Benefits of a Graduate Assistantshippage 11
14.	Disadvantages of a Graduate Assistantshippage 11
15.	Suggestions to Improve Assistantship Programpage 12
Appendix	u

A. Questionnaire for Graduate Assistantship Survey..... pages 13-16



Graduate Assistant Survey

The study reported here was undertaken at the recommendation of the Graduate Committee of Northern Michigan University. It's major objectives were to describe the graduate assistants' responsibilities, assess their work load and working conditions, and provide a means whereby the assistants could make suggestions for improving the assistantship program. All data were obtained by a mailed questionnaire distributed in February, 1970, to all graduate assistants at Northern Michigan University, 60 in all. Fifty-nine usable questionnaires were returned; the only nonrespondent was an assistant who left the University soon after the questionnaire was mailed.

Two previous studies provided useful guidelines in development of the survey instrument. Both of the studies covered not only graduate assistants, but also regularly enrolled graduate students. These studies were both conducted at institutions granting the Ph.D. degree (Michigan State University and The University of Cincinnati) and therefore, included a number of research oriented questions which were not applicable to Northern Michigan University.

Results of the Survey

The distribution of respondents is shown by sex and department in Table1.

As can be seen from that table, 32 of the respondents were men and 27 were women.

An almost equal distribution between married and single assistants was found: 29 married-30 single. Forty-five of the assistants were United States citizens. Fifty of the assistants were in the first year of their assistantship and nine in their second year. Of the fifty in their first year, 23 planned to continue for a second year.



From Table 2, it may be noted that more than half the assistants (34) received their Bachelor's degree from Northern Michigan University. About 18% received their Bachelor's degree outside Michigan and about 18% from schools outside the United States. Only three assistants got their Bachelor's degree from other schools in Michigan.

From Table 3, it can be seen that a little over half the assistants (35) were between the ages of 20-25. Since many of them were quite young, most of the assistants had received their Bachelor's degree in 1969 or 1970, as shown by Table 4.

Table 5, which details previous full-time work experience, shows that only 13 of the assistants had had prior full-time teaching experience. This is consistent with the already noted finding that almost two-thirds of them had received their Bachelor's degree the previous year. More than one-third of the assistants (23) had had no previous full-time work experience, but about 20% (12) had five or more years of combined teaching and other work experience.

Table 6 shows that 47 of the 59 assistants needed financial help in addition to the salary received from the assistantship. The single largest source of help was a husband or wife who worked to help support the family. Only eight of the 29 assistants who were married did not indicate that their spouse was employed.

From the number of credits carried by the assistants (Table 7), it is apparent that most took only two courses during the fall and spring semesters; as noted later in this report, this was commented upon by a number of the assistants. Seventeen assistants, both fall and spring, took three courses which is, according to the Graduate Bulletin of the University, one course more than is normally recommended. Also, one assistant was enrolled for four courses in the fall semester.

Table 8 shows the assistants' anticipated employment after the Master's degree

is obtained. The three areas dealing primarily with continued work in education, as might be expected, received the largest number of responses. One area "Don't Know" or other than listed got the second highest number of responses (23%), indicating that some assistants were still uncertain as to their future plans.

The average number of hours devoted per week to work and study is summarized in Tables 9 and 10. All but ten of the assistants reported that they actively engaged in teaching and 29 indicated that they spent some time in assisting other faculty to grade papers, administer and correct tests, etc. A relatively small number (about one-fourth) reported that they advised undergraduate students, and about 30% reported devoting some time to research activities.

It seems evident from Table 9 that there was substantial variability in the number of hours which assistants devoted to work responsibilities. A few assistants reported that more than 30 hours per week were devoted to their assistantship, whereas a small number reported an average of ten hours or less per week. Similarly, the total work week, Table 10 (assistantship plus study) varied greatly even if one assumes some error in reporting; it appears that some assistants put in a total work week of 60 hours or more, whereas a few others spent 20 hours or less in work and study. On the average, however, the assistants devoted 20 hours per week to work and 23 to study for a total of 43 hours exclusive of class time.

Assistants who were teaching were asked to indicate the extent of assistance received from a full-time faculty member; their responses are shown in Table 11.

About 16% of the 49 assistants who were teaching indicated that they received little or not assistance, 65% said that an instructor was available when needed and 18% that substantial assistance was received (every or almost every class period).

The assistants were also asked to evaluate the supervision received on non-

teaching responsibilities (Table 12). Two assistants felt that they were supervised too closely, 38 responded that they received about the right amount of supervision and one indicated that no supervision was received, but that some was needed. The remaining 18 assistants had no non-teaching responsibilities.

Since graduate assistants at some institutions have inadequate office space, the assistants were asked to evaluate the adequacy of their office space at Northern. Most, 86%, indicated that they had adequate office facilities.

Tables 13 through 15 are summaries of responses to open ended questions designed to elicit from the assistants their feelings about the strengths and weaknesses of the graduate assistantship program at Northern and what, if anything, they might recommend in the way of changes.

As might be expected, financial help was the most often mentioned benefit of an assistantship. The chance to teach was cited as the next most important benefit, followed by the exposure to new learning experiences. The opportunity to become familiar with University operations and to interact with faculty and staff were also mentioned as significant benefits.

Very few of the assistants, as Table 14 shows, found any great problems with the graduate assistantship program. Twelve mentioned limited social interaction and study time. Following this in frequency of mention was the restriction placed on the number of credit hours a graduate assistant could take. As noted earlier, almost one-third of the graduate assistants took more than the eight credit limit. This situation probably needs study, since the eight credit limit seems not to be followed in practice. Another disadvantage cited by nine of the assistants, was where they stand in relation to the faculty and student body. Some felt that they were in a grey limbo area between the two and with no base to which they can or possibly should be tied.



A fairly wide range of suggestions were made for improving the assistantship program. Although an attempt was made to combine the suggestions, as can be seen from Table 15, there were a rather large number of unrelated ideas expressed.

Summary and Conclusions

To summarize, more men than women were hired as graduate assistants, most were young (between 21 and 25) and most had received their Bachelor's degree from Northern either in 1969 or 1970. Since most of the assistants were quite young, very few of them had previous teaching experience, although almost half of them had some previous full-time non-teaching work experience.

A large number of assistants needed more financial help to get through school than was offered by the salary attached to the assistantship alone. This help was most often obtained from an employed spouse. A substantial number of assistants took more than the recommended number of credit hours each semester; several were critical of the eight hour restriction. Perhaps the restriction should be more consistently enforced or removed from the Graduate Bulletin.

As could be expected most of the assistants anticipated employment in education after receiving the M.A. degree. A number of them, however, were undecided about employment following graduation.

In amount of time devoted to the assistantship and hours of study per week, a wide variance was found between assistants. Some assistants spent over 60 hours a week in study and work, while others spent less than 20 hours. Insofar as time devoted to the assistantship was concerned, a few students spent 10 hours or less per week and a few 30 hours or more, although the average was about 20 hours. The average for both study and work time was about 43 hours.



Most of the teaching assistants felt that there was someone around if they needed assistance during class periods. The reaction of most assistants to the extent of supervision of non-teaching responsibilities was that it was about right. One assistant felt that supervision was needed but that none was received.

The most often mentioned benefit of an assistantship was the financial reward.

Many assistants mentioned that without it they could not have continued their education.

Another benefit mentioned by a number of assistants was the opportunity it provided them to actually teach a university class. The most frequently mentioned disadvantages were the lack of study time and opportunity for social interaction. From a number of comments made by the assistants there seems a need for better communication between the assistants and their departments to more clearly spell out their duties and the benefits of an assistantship. This could help reduce the feeling mentioned by a number of assistants of being in limbo.

Finally, a general overall view would be that most graduate assistants were well satisfied with their work load, study time, and general conditions of employment at Northern Michigan University.

Table 1. Graduate Assistants by Department and Sex.

Department	Men	Women	Total
Biology	7	5	12
Chemistry	4	3 ·	7
English	2	3	5
Foreign Language	1	0	1
Geography	1	0	1
History	3	1	4
Mathematics	1	2	. 3
Music	0	1	1
	1	4	5
Speech	1	4	5
Education	4	1	5
Physical Education	7	- 1	1
Home Economics	5		5
Industrial Education	ə	9	3
Business Education	. 1	^	1
Institutional Research	_1		
Total	32	27	59

Table 2. Origin of Bachelor's Degree.

		Number	Percentage
Northern Michigan University	;	34	59
Other in Michigan		3	5
Out of Michigan		11	18
Foreign		<u>11</u>	18
		59	100

Table 3. Graduate Assistants by Age.

Age		Number	Percentage
41+		6	. 10
31-40		7	12
26-30	Victor No.	11	18
20-25		<u>35</u>	<u>59</u>
		59	100

Table 4. Year that Bachelor's Degree was Earned.

Year	Number	Percentage
1965 or earlier	6	10
1966	4	7
1967	8	14
1968	5	8
1969	33	56
1970	_3	_5
•	59	100

Table 5. Distribution of Graduate Assistants by Years of Prior Full-Time Work Experience.

	Tea	ching	Other	Total
Years	N	<u>%</u> -	<u>N</u> %	<u>N</u> %
5 or more	. 3	5	10 17	12 20
4	1	2	3 5	4 7
3	1	2	7 12	10 17
2	5	¹ 8	4 7	8 14
1	3	5	3 5	2 3
None	<u>46</u>	78	<u>32 54</u>	<u>23</u> <u>39</u>
	59	100	59 100	59 100

Table 6. Sources of Funds in Addition to Assistantship.

Source	<u>Number</u>	Percentage*
Spouse Works	21	36
Other Jobs	12	20
Loan Funds		12
Parents		12
Other Sources	10	17

^{*} Percent of 59 graduate assistants who reported each source

Table 7. Credits Carried.

		Fall	Spring		
Credit Hours		<u>N</u> %	<u>N</u> %		
13-16		1 2	0 0		
9-12		17 29	17 29		
5- 8	· And a second second	32 54	38 64		
0-4		9 15	4 7		
·		59 100	59 100		

Table 8. Anticipated Employment after Graduation.

Anticipated Employment	Number	Percentage
Doctoral Studies	13	22
Elementary or Secondary School	20	34
University or College	10	1 7
Federal Government	1	2
Business or Industry	1	2
Other or Don't Know	14	<u>23_</u>
	59	100

Table 9. Distribution of Graduate Assistants by Hours Devoted Per Week to Assistantship Duties.

				ding						
	Tea	ching	Pa	pers	Adv	ising	Res	search	<u>Oth</u>	er
Hours	N	<u>%</u>	N	<u>%</u>	N	<u>%</u>	N	<u>%</u>	N	<u>%</u>
41 or more	1	2	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
31-40	. 0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0.	. 0	0	0
21-30	. 8	14	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0 -
11-20	27	45	1	2	0	0	4	7	3	5
6-10	10	17	7	12	0	0	. 0	0	4	7
1-5	3	5	21	35	15	25	14	24	10	17
None	10	17	30	<u>51</u>	44	75	41	<u>69</u>	42	71
	59	100	59	100	59	100	59	100	59	100

Table 10. Distribution of Graduate Assistants by Hours of Work and Study Per Week.

•	Assist	antship	Study	Total
Hours	$\overline{\mathbf{N}}$	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u> %	<u>n</u> %
Over 61	0	0	1 2	2 3
51-60	0	0	0 0	9 15
41-50	1	2	1 2	19 23
31-40	3	5	10 17	24 41
21-30	12	20	14 23	3 5
11-20	38	65	29 49	2 3
0-10	_5_	8	4 7	0 0
	59	100	59 100	59 109

Table 11. Assistance Received with Teaching Responsibilities.

Extent of Supervis	ion		Number	Percentage
Substantial			9	18
Occasional			32	65
Infrequent or None		.	8	16

Table 12. Satisfaction with Supervision of Non-Teaching Responsibilities.

Reaction to Supervision	Number	Percentage
Supervised too closely	2	5
About right amount	38	9 3
No supervision, but some needed	1	2

Table 13. Benefits of a Graduate Assistantship.

Benefit	Number	Percentage*
Financial help	38	64
Opportunity for teaching experience	24	41
Exposure to many learning experiences	20	34
Participation in the operations of a University	12	20
Opportunities to interact with faculty and staff	12	20
Special privileges such as: use of facilities when needed, parking, library	5	8
Opportunity for research experience	1	2

^{*} Percent of assistants who mentioned benefit

Table 14. Disadvantages of a Graduate Assistantship.

Disadvantage	Number	Percentage *
Study time and social interaction		
are limited	12	20
Cannot enroll for more than 8 cre-		
dit hours	9	15
Hard to separate role as teacher		
and role as student	9	15
Financial assistance too small	6	10
Assistants are at the service of the		
department	6	10
Poor communications of job requirements	4	7

^{*} Percent of assistants who mentioned disadvantage

Table 15. Suggestions to Improve Assistantship Program.

Suggestion	Number	Percentage*
Better communication of assistant-		
ship work requirements and bene-	7	12
fits	(. 12
Allow attendance at faculty func-		
tions such as staff meetings, con-		
ferences, etc.	4	7
Reduce number of hours of work re-		÷
quired and equalize among depart-		
ments	4	7
Allow more teaching	4	7
Give student teaching or graduate		_
credit for teaching	3	5
Offer more research assistant-		•
ships	3	. 5
Establish graduate student associa-		_
tion	3	5
Increase pay	3	5
A lounge where students and faculty		
can meet informally	1	2
Have separate living quarters on cam-		
pus for graduate students	1	2
Establish summer assistantships	1	2
Lighten assistants academic load		
during regular school year and pay		
during summer for work performed		
during year	1	2
Eliminate evening classes, move		
them into regular class day	1	2
Allow assistants to have keys for		
their buildings	1	2

^{*} Percent of assistants who mentioned suggestion

NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY Office of Institutional Research Graduate Assistant Survey

Write in This		
Space		
l <i>-</i> 2	Department:	
	0 Com M T	
3-4	1. Age in Years: 2. Sex: MF	
5		
<u> </u>		
6	3. Mariial Status:	
	Married	
	Single	
	Other	
7	4. Country of citizenship: U.SOther (specify)	
to product and		
8	5. Origin of Bachelor's Degree;	
	NMUOther Michigan School (specify)	
	School outside of Michigan (specify)	
	School outside of U.S. (specify)	
	believe duration of e. s. (opening)	
9-10	Year degree was received:	
<u> </u>		
	6. Prior full-time work experience (report only if 6 months or more	e)
	Type Number of Years (nearest years)	
11-12	Teaching	
13-14	Non-teaching	
15-16	Total	
17	7. Status as a graduate assistant (check):	
	First year	
	Second year	
10	If first year, do you plan to continue assistantship next	
18	year? Yes No	
	Jour 1 205 110	



		•
Do not Write in This Space		
19	8. Assistance with teaching responsibilities: If you were teaching either fall or spring s check the statement which best describes t assistance received from a full-time facul	the amount of
	department. If you did not teach, check it	•
	Substantial assistance (every or almost period)	
	2. Occasional assistance (instructor avail needed)	able when
	3. Infrequent or no assistance	
	4. Had no teaching responsibility	
30	9. Check the statement which best describes y supervision of your non-teaching responsit	
	1. Supervised more closely than I would l	ike
	2. Just about the right amount of supervis	
	3. Some supervision but less than I would	
the state of the s	4. No supervision but some needed	
	5. Have no non-teaching responsibilities	
	10. Estimate the average number of hours spe following activities as a part of your work	
21-22	Activity	Hours per week
	1. Teaching including preparation for	
	teaching (all work related to class	
	you teach)	•
23-24	2. Grading papers, giving and	
	correcting tests, etc. for other	
	faculty	
25-26	3. Research assistance (including	
	library research)	
27-28	4. Advising undergraduate	
2. 20	students	
29-30	5. Other (explain)	
29-30	5. Other (explain)	
	- model	
	Total	
	11. Academic work load carried as a student:	
31-32	Number of credit hours: Fall	
33-34	Spring	•
35-36	Average number of hours spent	
37-38	in study per week	
<u> </u>	In Study per week	•

Do not	
Write in This	
Space	· ·
39	12. Anticipated employment after completing graduate work (check one)
	Doctoral studies
	Elementary or Secondary School
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	University or College
	Federal Government
	State or local Government
	Business or Industry
	Other (specify)
	Not known
•	
	13. Source of funds other than assistantship (check all that apply)
40	1. Tutoring
41	2. Loan funds
42	3. Scholarships
43	4. Parents
44	5. Spouse works
45	6. Other jobs
46	7. Other source (explain)
and the second s	
47	14. Office space (check the appropriate statement)
	1. Adequate
	2. Inadequate
	3. None
	4. Other (explain)
	15. Benefits of a Graduate Assistantship (briefly describe one or
A Maria Company of the Company of the	more ways in which an assistantship is of benefit to you.)



Do not Write in This Space

16. Disadvantages of being a Graduate Assistant:

17. Suggestions for improving the assistantship program (e.g. changes in university policy, department procedures, working conditions and relationships, opportunities for professional growth, social life, etc.)

